



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS

MASON, J. ALDEN. — The Language of the Salinan Indians. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1-154. Berkeley, 1918.

Our previous knowledge of the language of the Salinan Indians, of southwestern California, had been embodied in Sitjar's not easily accessible "Vocabulary of the Language of San Antonio Mission, California" (Shea's Library of American Linguistics, 1861) and in a very brief sketch of Kroeber's published in 1904. The present work is another of those happily increasing studies for which future Americanists will be thankful, studies of aboriginal languages doomed to extinction within at most a few decades. Mason has in this volume given us the linguistic results of two field trips to Monterey County in 1910 and 1916, besides a convenient summary of the older material contained in Sitjar. The whole makes a very useful compendium of the language in both its extant dialects, Antoniaño and Migueleño. To the treatment of the phonology (pp. 7-17) and of the morphology (pp. 18-58) are added a series of twenty-seven Antoniaño and eleven Migueleño texts with both interlinear and free translations (pp. 59-120) and a systematic vocabulary of all extant Salinan words (pp. 121-154). The handling of the language, which is characterized by considerable irregularity, is competent. A number of obscure or imperfectly analyzed features remain, but these are as much due to the fragmentary nature of our material as to any shortcomings on the part of the author. The language is moderately synthetic in structure, with a drift towards analytic methods.

Mason's treatment of the Salinan phonetic system, as a system and without regard to sound relationships, is eminently satisfactory and shows considerable grounding in general phonetics. It is refreshingly unlike the amateurish sound surveys that have generally done duty in American linguistics for "phonetics". The description of *a* (p. 7) as "mid-mixed-narrow", however, is an error, probably an oversight; *a* is a "back", not a "mixed" vowel. Less satisfactory are Mason's contributions to the phonology of Salinan. For purposes of linguistic comparison it is important to know not so much the distinctive sounds found, in their various nuances, in a given language, as the irreducible set of organically, or better etymologically, distinct sounds with which one has to operate. Thus, to say that two languages both possess a given sound, say *x*, is not even suggestive unless we know that the status of the *x* is analogous, in other words, that it is in both a primary consonant or secondarily derived from an identical source. From this standpoint Mason, like most Americanists, leaves something to be desired. It is not altogether easy to be clear, for instance, from his data whether the aspirated surds are an organically independent series or merely a secondary development of the intermediate-surds. The former is the impression conveyed in the phonetic portion of the paper, the latter as the data unfold themselves in the body of the work. In other words, it would seem that the Yana-Pomo-Shastan-Chimariko organic differentiation, say, of older *k* and *k'* has been obliterated (or never developed) in Salinan and that Salinan *k'*, and apparently often *x*, are but secondary developments of *k* (leveled or

original); cf. Salinant *ko-* NOT with Yana *k'u-* and Chimariko *xu-* (from **k'u-*). Further comparative research may lead us to modify this view. Meanwhile it seems fairly clear that the great majority of instances of Salinan aspirated surds are merely due to positional causes.

Mason's examples of "metathesis" (p. 15) are not convincing. They seem best explained as due to vocalic syncope, e. g. *lice* YEAR: *elci'-tanel* YEARS in all probability presupposes an originally trisyllabic stem with initial vowel *elici-*, *elice-*. The recognition of this type of stem, which may almost be considered the original norm for the Hokan languages (e. g. **ipali* TONGUE, **axwati* BLOOD) would, in general, have helped to clear up more than one stubborn feature of Salinan phonetics or morphology. In particular, I am inclined to suspect that many examples analyzed by Mason as consisting of prefixed consonant plus vowel followed by stem with initial consonant would have been more accurately interpreted as consonantal prefix followed by stem with initial vowel. Salinan here offers precisely the same difficulties and perplexities that Dixon met with in Chimariko.

Under reduplication (p. 14) Mason omits to mention several interesting examples of final reduplication in Salinan, e. g. *t-ikelele* ROUND, *k-itspilil* PAINTED, *t'pelel* STRIPED, *exoxo* BRAIN. This would not be so important if not for the presence of analogous forms in other Hokan-Coahuiltecan languages, e. g. Chimariko *le'tretre* SPOTTED, *-poxolxol* TO PAINT; Washo *tamo'mo* WOMAN, *tewi'wi* YOUTH; Pomo *pololo* ROUND, *matoto* THUNDER; Tonkawa *pilil* ROUND. There are also indications of the former existence in Salinan of a method of forming the plural by final reduplication, e. g. *icxexe* FEET (this is doubtful because *-cx-* seems often in Salinan to act as a single consonant related to *-c-*), *t-icxepilip* FEET (apparently old plural **-icxepilip* later re-pluralized by infixed *-l-*). This is very

suggestive, as final reduplication to express plurality of the noun is much in evidence in Esselen and Washo.

There seems some evidence for a diminutive suffix *-la-*, though this is not explicitly recognized by Mason, e. g. *cxapa-la-t* PEBBLE (cf. *cxap* STONE); *t'o'-l* HEAP (cf. *t'oi* MOUNTAIN); *lua-ne-lo* SLAVE (cf. *lua* MAN); *k-eke'-l-e* TO HAVE A FATHER (cf. *ek* FATHER); *ito-l* BROTHER, plur. *ito'-la-nel*; *mace-l* GREAT-GRANDCHILD. The establishment of a diminutive suffix *-la-* would receive its due significance by referring to the common Chimariko diminutive *-l-(la)*, *-la-*; this element is also frequently found in Chimariko terms of relationship.

One of the most interesting and irregular features of Salinan is the formation of the plural of nouns and of the plural and iterative of verbs. No less than a dozen distinct types and a large number of irregular formations are discussed and illustrated by Mason, the great majority of them involving a suffixed or infixed *-t-*, *-n-*, or *-l-*. Significantly analogous plurals, often of great irregularity though of less frequency, are found in Yana; e. g. such Salinan plurals as *t-eteyitinai* ARROWS (sing. *t-eteyini'*) and *anetem* SEVERAL REMAIN (sing. *anem*) offer more than a cursory parallel to such Yana forms as *mut'djau'ti-wi* CHIEFS (sing. *mu'djau-pa'*), *k'uru'-wi* SHAMANS (*-r-* < *-d-*; sing. *ku'-wi*), *sa'dimsi-* SEVERAL SLEEP (sing. *samsi-*, *sams-*). The Salinan type with infixed *-h-*, *-x-* (e. g. *mehen-* HANDS, sing. *men-*; *kaxau* SEVERAL SLEEP, sing. *kau*) may be analogous to such Yana forms as *dja'li-* SEVERAL LAUGH (from **djahali-*?), sing. *djal-*.

The most striking feature of Salinan noun morphology is the prefixing of an element *t-* or *t-*. This prefix occurs both in primary nouns and in nominal derivatives of verb stems. When the noun is preceded by possessive pronominal prefixes, the *t-* sometimes appears before the pronominal element, at other times

it is lacking. It seems highly probable, moreover, that a number of other *t-* prefixes (verbal and local) that Mason discusses in the progress of his sketch are etymologically identical with the nominal *t-* (e. g. conditional *t-*, *ta-*, p. 44). It is most plausibly interpreted as a kind of nominal article of originally demonstrative force (cf. Hokan demonstrative stem **ta*; this fuller form seems to be found in Salinan enclitic *-ta* NOW). It offers a striking and probably significant analogy to Washo *d-*, similarly prefixed to both primary and derivative nouns. The possessive pronominal prefixes of Salinan offer important analogies to the corresponding elements of other Hokan languages, notably Chimariko and Washo; the lack of a distinct pronominal prefix for the first person singular is paralleled, it would seem, in Yuman.

In discussing the pronominal system of Salinan, Mason points out the presence of six more or less distinct series of elements: the independent personal pronouns; the "proclitic" series, which might better have been frankly recognized as constituting true prefixes (they occur only as verb subjects and are closely connected with the stem, whose initial vowels they sometimes displace); the objective elements, suffixed to the verb; the locative series (e. g. NEAR ME, TO HIM); the possessive prefixes; and the enclitic subjects. The last of these, however, are merely a secondarily abbreviated set derived from the independent pronouns. Of the others, the objective series stands out, for the most part, as distinctive, the others show considerable interrelationship. The locative series, in particular, is evidently closely related, not, as Mason remarks, to the independent series, but to the "proclitics" and possessives. It is compounded of the pronominal element proper and a preceding *k-*, *ke-*, evidently an old locative or objective particle (cf. Yana objective and locative particle *gi*); hence, e. g., *-k'e* ME (locative) and *-keo* HIM (locative) are to be analyzed

as *k(e)-'e* TO-ME and *ke-o* TO-HIM (such a form as Mason's *te-wa·kok'e* NEAR ME is most easily interpreted as *t-e-wa·ko k'e* THE-PROXIMITY TO-ME). The close parallelism between the first person singular and plural forms in Salinan is characteristic of other Hokan languages; the contrast of the *e* (*i*) or zero of the singular with the *a* of the plural is strikingly reminiscent of Chimariko.

In the section on "temporal proclitics" (pp. 34, 35) there is betrayed a certain incompleteness or haltingness of analysis which is in evidence also elsewhere in the book. Phonetically, this comes out in the author's treatment of the pronominal prefix or initial vowel of the stem, which is often mistakenly, I imagine, drawn to the proclitic. To say that "the prefix *ma-* probably differs only phonetically from *me-* [WHEN]" (p. 25) is misleading. Such examples as *me-yam* WHEN I SEE and *ma-yal* WHEN WE GO suggest strongly the analysis *m-e-yam* and *m-a-yal* with the regular "proclitic" pronouns *e-* I and *a-* WE. Morphologically, Mason does not seem to realize the probable denominating, in part demonstrative, origin of his temporal proclitics. They are only secondarily subordinating elements. Such a form as *be-ya* WHEN I WENT (better *b-e-ya* or contracted *be-eya*) is, without doubt, an indicative *-e-ya* I WENT subordinated by the demonstrative stem *pe*, *pa* "the, that"; THAT I-WENT, whence WHEN I WENT, is a method of subordination that seems to be paralleled by like constructions in Yana and is strongly reminiscent of Siouan.

The use of the perplexing verbal prefixes *p-* and *k-* (pp. 38, 39) suggests a fundamental generic classification of verbs. Mason himself doubtfully describes the *p-* verbs as transitives, the *k-* verbs as intransitives (e. g. *k-enai* TO HURT ONESELF, *p-enai* TO WOUND). This is the most obvious explanation but there are many difficulties in the way of its acceptance. That

p- verbs embrace such ideas as TO THINK and TO CIRCLE AROUND seems to suggest that the proper basis of classification is not so much transitive and intransitive as active and static, as in Haida-Tlingit, Siouan, and Chimariko. A more intensive study of the Salinan material, supplemented eventually by comparison with Chumash, Yuman, Seri, and possibly Coahuiltecan-Tonkawa (cf. Comecrudo *pa-* verbs and Seri, like Salinan, adjectives in *k-*), will doubtless clear up this fundamental problem of Salinan morphology. The *t-* verbs (pp. 39, 40) seem most intelligibly explained as subordinates (conjunctives), morphologically nothing but nominalized forms, the *t-* being identical, as Mason suggests with reserve, with the common nominal *t-* prefix. This explanation gains force from the fact that the *t-* forms regularly replace *p-* and *k-* forms after "proclitic" and other prefixed elements. Thus, such a form as *ram-t'-xwen* THEN (HE) ARRIVED is really THEN-THE-ARRIV(ING), THEN (IT IS) THAT (HE) ARRIVED; similarly *me-t-amp'* WHEN (IT) CAME OUT must be understood as TIME-THE-COMING OUT. Such constructions, it need hardly be added, are common in America.

The negative verbal prefix *ko-*, *k-* (pp. 41, 42) offers many points of similarity with the Chimariko negative *xu-*, *x-*. The pronominal element follows in Salinan, regularly precedes in Chimariko. Dixon, however, remarks that the first person singular negative of verbs with *y-*, *i-* as first person singular pronominal prefix is generally *xe-*, the *-e-* replacing frequently the initial vowel of the stem. This feature is so isolated as to appear archaic; it strongly, and perhaps significantly, parallels Salinan *k-e* NOT I.

The locative adverbs and prepositions (pp. 55-57) are frequently characterized by certain prefixed elements (*ma-*; *tuma-*; *um-*; *tum-*; *umpa-*, *tumpa-*; *tu-*, *ti-*) which seem to me not quite fully understood by Mason. The most likely analysis, it seems to me, assumes a

petrified noun **uma-* PLACE, THERE, which may appear abbreviated to *ma-* or *um-*, according to phonetic, perhaps accentual, conditions. To this element may be prefixed the article-like *t-*, while the demonstrative *pa* THAT may follow. The correctness of this view is corroborated by such an independent adverb as *tumpa* THERE, evidently *t-um-pa* THE-PLACE-THAT; similarly, *rum-t'-ca'* IN THE WATER is to be understood as *r-um-t'-ca'* THE (*r-<t-*)-PLACE-THE-WATER. The element *um-*, *ma-*, *-uma-* is cognate to *ma-* forms in Yana, Chimariko, and Pomo.

A detailed linguistic analysis of the first text (pp. 64-67) makes concrete in the mind of the reader what has been given in analytic form in the grammatical survey. This analysis is convincing in the main. The chief misunderstandings, if I may be allowed the term, are due to a failure to recognize in all cases the nominal *t-* prefix and to a tendency to cut loose the initial vowel of the stem or the pronominal "proclitic" vowel and attach it to the preceding consonant. Thus, the form *tiyaten'*, translated as (THEN WHY) TO GO ALSO? (freely, WHY SHOULD I COME?) is analyzed as consisting of a general preposition *ti-*, the stem *ya*, and the iterative suffix *-ten*. Far more plausible is the analysis *t-iya-ten* (WHY) THE-GOING-ALSO? (stem *iya*, *ia*; cf. Washo *iye* TO GO), possibly *t-i-ya-ten* (WHY) THE-I-GO-ALSO? The "preposition" *ti-* is probably a phantom.

In view of the rapidly increasing importance of lexical comparisons in American linguistics, the full Salinan vocabulary included by Mason is in the highest degree welcome and will eventually constitute not the least valuable part of the book. It is precisely because of the growing importance of comparative work that I have in this review emphasized points of relationship between Salinan and other languages of its group, for that it belongs to the group provisionally known as "Hokan" is now abundantly clear. Much more might have been

advanced on this point than I have touched upon, but a review is not the proper place for a full discussion.

E. SAPIR.

RENWARD BRANDSTETTER. — Die Reduplikation in den indianischen, indonesischen und indogermanischen Sprachen (Beilage zum Jahresbericht der Luzerner Kantonschule): 1917.

In this treatise the author gives a survey of those phenomena of reduplication which are found in each of the three groups of languages mentioned in the title. Types found in only one or two of these groups, however interesting they may be, are left out of consideration. Each type mentioned is represented by one example drawn from each of the three groups. When the author assures us that his examples are taken from the best texts we are, of course, quite willing to believe him; but still we should have been much obliged to him if he had taken the trouble to mention his sources in each separate case. Especially regarding the origin of his Indian examples some more information would not have been superfluous, since even an americanist can hardly be supposed to recognise these sources by intuition. The paper is purely descriptive throughout: it is an enumeration of parallels, and even the relations between forms and functions have hardly been taken notice of. So the reader who expects to learn something about the essential character of this interesting phenomenon will be sorely disappointed: what he does learn is that, even after Brandstetter's list of parallels from a great number of linguistic stocks published in 1917, Pott's well-known book on reduplication, printed in 1862, remains our best starting-point for further inquiry. Evidently Brandstetter himself is not aware of this fact; at least he never shows that he is, though it is hardly to

be supposed that the imposing array of data presented by that eminent scholar has not materially facilitated his own investigations.

As Brandstetter's study practically contains neither new facts nor new ideas, the task of his reviewer is not a grateful one.

It might have been otherwise if the author had made an effort to penetrate a little deeper into his subject. That he has not done so is the more astonishing because some valuable preparatory work has already been done. Already Pott had perceived that the numerous and very divergent functions of reduplication (in its widest sense) may, all of them, be traced back to the same psychic motive. He speaks of "quantitative steigerung", which, however, may lead to a qualitative change of meaning (Pott, *Die Reduplikation*, p. 22). About 45 years later the same idea was much more technically expressed by van Ginneken when he demonstrated that all reduplication is a manifestation of psychic energy (Jac. van Ginneken, *Principes de linguistique psychologique*, see Index s. v. redoublements). Pott distinguished further between intensive and extensive "steigerung": the former manifesting itself e. g. in reduplicated interjections, "lallwörter", onomatopoeia; the latter in reduplicated plurals and distributive numerals. Thus far these two groups of Pott correspond to van Ginneken's general classification, which distinguishes between extrinsic and intrinsic energy; but Pott's conception of the essential character of each group is rather superficial. As to this point van Ginneken's argument opens a new aspect. According to him the difference between e. g. "lallwörter" and plurals consists in this that the psychic energy manifesting itself in the reduplication in the former case originates from the emotional attitude of the speaker and in the latter case is stimulated by the meaning of the grammatical form itself. In his opinion the types of reduplication belonging to group I